UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,613	10/28/2003	Lillian R. Paolino	P/113-14	6303

7590 10/17/2007

Philip M. Weiss
Weiss & Weiss
300 Old Country Road
Suite 251
Mineola, NY 11501

EXAMINER	
DANG, HUNG XUAN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2873	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/695,613	PAOLINO, LILLIAN R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hung X. Dang	2873	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/3/07.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-12 and 16-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 13-15 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. **Claims Rejection Under 35 USC – 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Thayer et al** (6,131,209) in view of **Beames** (D 466,543).

Thayer et al discloses eyewear comprises solid frames 60 having a lens; said frame 60 consisting of a one piece solid molded frame; said frames having a nose bridge which fits on top of a users nose; said frames secured around a user's head by a single band 52; said band 52 secured to said frames 60 by two securing pieces wherein said band 52 is removed from said frame by either or both of said securing pieces wherein Velcro is used for both securing pieces; wherein said band 52 can be totally removed from said frames and replaced with other similar bands. (see at least figure 5 and the related disclosure.)

Thayer et al teach a single lens in the frame, Thayer et al does not teach that a pair of lenses as that claimed by Applicant.

Eyeglasses have long been designed with the general objective of correction the vision of the eye of the wears. Numerous designs of dual lens glasses and single lens glasses have been developed, differing only in aesthetic feature.

Beames, however, discloses the frames having a pair of lenses.

Because Thayer et al and Beames are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose of aesthetic feature as disclosed by Beames would have been recognized as an art pertinent art of Thayer et al.

It would have been obvious, therefore, at the time the invention was made to a person having skill in the art to construct the eyeglasses frame, such as the one disclosed by Thayer et al, with a pair of lenses, such as disclosed by Beames for the purpose of the purpose of aesthetic feature.

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC – 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by **Sadowsky** (5,042,094).

Sadowsky discloses eyewear with prosthetic parts for small children comprises frame (30) for holding two lenses (20), the frame (the frame 30 is constructed with resilient material, preferably also soft and pliable see colun 3, lines 21 and 22) secured to a head by a band (40), said band (40) secured to the frames by two securing pieces (42) including Velcro is used for both securing pieces and the band (40) can be totally removed from the frame and replaced with other similar band (see figure 1 and the

related disclosure.) Note that solid frame means the frame having the interior completely filled up and free from cavity, or not hollow.

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC – 102

3. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by **Laschober** (4,930,885).

Laschober discloses eyeglasses with releasable headband support arrangement comprises one piece solid molded frame (14) for holding two lenses (16), the frame (14) having a nose beidge (18) with fits on top of the user nose, the frame (14) secured to a head by a band (28), said band (28) secured to the frames by two securing pieces (30), wherein the band (28) is removed from the frame by either or both of the securing means (see figures 1-4 and the related disclosure.)

Response to Applicant's argument

4. Applicant's arguments filed 8/3/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument that "Applicant holds and the Examiner has stated previously that Thayer requires the specialized compartment and therefore in combination with Beames the compartment is still required. Since the claims are written with "consisting of" language, the claims must be allowable over the above prior art. " the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Dang at telephone number (571) 272-2326.

10/07

HUNG DANG

PRIMARY EXAMINER

TC 2800